11:50:00 From Victoria Ashby : Special session proclamationhttps://le.utah.gov/session/2020S3/Proclamation.pdf

11:50:35 From Eric : What is the AIP web page address?

11:51:15 From Angela Price : apautah.org

11:54:30 From MEGAN RYAN : Please use chat box for any questions

12:01:04 From Mike Wilcox : What about changes made by lot line adjustments? Are those considered a plat amendment?

12:01:08 From Bill Cobabe : does the 10 lot subdivision thing have an allowance for required infrastructure?

12:01:42 From Bill Cobabe : that is, does a ROW/or PUE ddedication require land use authority approval?

12:03:12 From Nora Shepard : Will there still be a recordable documents for plats for fewer than 10 lots? How can we track it otherwise?

12:03:21 From Jay Aguilar, UDOT : Does that mean that 10 lot or less subdivisions are good forever?

12:03:49 From Bill Cobabe : thank you!

12:05:51 From Krishna Shrivastava : Less than 10 lots - Implications for recording for Property Tax purposes?

12:06:14 From Mike Wilcox : 388

12:06:44 From Nora Shepard : Were County Recorders part of this no plat discussion? Should we reach out to our County Recorders to discuss this?

12:07:36 From MEGAN RYAN : Yes nora they were included

12:08:07 From Jay Aguilar, UDOT : Is there a great likelihood that we'll see non-plated 10+10+10...subdivisions?

12:09:31 From mhyde : (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a plat is not required if:
820 (a) a municipality establishes a process to approve an administrative land use decision
821 for a subdivision of 10 or fewer lots without a plat; and
822 (b) the municipality provides in writing that:
823 [(a)] (i) the municipality has provided notice as required by ordinance; and
824 [(b)] (ii) the proposed subdivision:
825 [(i)] (A) is not traversed by the mapped lines of a proposed street as shown in the

826 general plan unless the municipality has approved the location and dedication of any public
827 street, municipal utility easement, any other easement, or any other land for public purposes as
828 the municipality's ordinance requires;
829 [(ii)] (B) has been approved by the culinary water authority and the sanitary sewer
830 authority;
831 [(iii)] (C) is located in a zoned area; and
832 [(iv)] (D) conforms to all applicable land

12:10:12 From mhyde : Based on HB 388, the municipality does not have to allow subdivisions of ten lots or fewer without a plat. it is optional

12:11:18 From Dannielle : HOORAY for SHAWN GUZMAN! He's the best!!!!!

12:13:19 From Valerie Claussen : the state of Nevada has some language in their code regarding what they call this which is serial subdivisions

12:13:49 From Valerie Claussen : (the 10+10+10 subdivisions)

12:14:22 From mhyde : We require subdividers to wait at least one year before doing another ten lot sub on the same property. There can be no ROW dedication or public utility extensions for these types of subdivisions.

12:14:39 From Krishna Shrivastava : Place a restriction on adjoining and contiguous property owned by the same Owner.

12:17:09 From Polly Samuels McLean : Is that appeal right just for administrative appeals or legislative

12:17:37 From Keith B : The restriction of "adversely affected parties" should follow the standard jurisprudence on standing. It seems pretty straight forward, IMHO.

12:17:42 From MEGAN RYAN : administrative

12:17:57 From Manning : So how does the community at large appeal, e.g. a marijuana grow house that has lights on all night and affects the whole community?

12:20:57 From Brian : Is this to get the entire permit reviewed or just the initial review? What happens with not reacting to redlines?

12:23:07 From Steve Parkinson : is the 14 days is only for single-family and duplexes

12:23:46 From Steve Mumford : The spreadsheet sent out by Herriman's building official has a place to track 1st review, 2nd review (if plan is rejected for changes), etc.

12:23:56 From Krishna Shrivastava : What happens if the AEP Consultant has to make revisions as part of the review process and takes or needs an extended period of time - RESUBMISSIONS?

12:24:09 From sdeseelhorst : So just to clarify, we can continue to use our own tracking software, and take the data from that software and use it to fill out the sheet provided to us?

12:24:30 From mhyde : Potentially massive conflict of interest problems if builders can hire their own inspectors!

12:24:45 From Bill Cobabe : this is not a good option necessarily for builders, BTW. The outside review often took longer and was more stringent than the in house review/inspections. It may seem like a good idea to have options, but in practice, it wasn't that beneficial...

12:25:13 From Jay Aguilar, UDOT : Can you charge for an outside engineer?

12:25:21 From Nora Shepard : My understanding is that Plan Review is for Building Permit issuance and does not include planning processes such as site plans

12:27:53 From sherriel : I think we are getting confused between the 14 days on single fam and duplex and the 21 days on the commercial permits.

12:28:30 From Krishna Shrivastava : What happens if the Zoning Variance Request, Site Plan Review, Building Permit Review and any other needed are submitted simultaneously.

12:28:41 From mhyde : " Plan review" means all of the reviews and approvals of a plan that a city requires to obtain a building permit from the city with a scope that may not exceed a review to verify:
(A) that the construction project complies with the provisions of the State Construction Code under Title 15A, State Construction and Fire Codes Act;
(B) that the construction project complies with the energy code adopted under Section 15A-2-103;
(C) that the construction project received a planning review;
(D) that the applicant paid any required fees;
(E) that the applicant obtained final approvals from any other required reviewing agencies;
(F) that the construction project complies with federal, state, and local storm water protection laws;
(G) that the construction project received a structural review; and

(H) the total square footage for each building level of finished, garage, and unfinished space.

12:28:57 From Krishna Shrivastava : AEP - Architecture Engineering Planning Consultant.

12:29:06 From Krishna Shrivastava : Thank you. I am a He.

12:29:28 From sherriel : Don't accept a building permit application until they have completed the land use processes.

12:29:48 From mhyde : Note that subsection C brings up the "planning review"

12:31:15 From mhyde : Good advice sherriel

12:32:25 From mhyde : Keep in mind that certain subdivision covenants may require certain bldg. design elements that the local govt can't waive or reduce...

12:33:22 From Krishna Shrivastava : Sherriel suggest adding check boxes for other permits and permit numbers with date of issue on the Building Permit Application.

12:34:06 From mhyde : Keep in mind that certain subdivision covenants may require certain bldg. design elements that the local govt can't waive or reduce...

12:34:58 From Duncan Murray : I missed part of the initial discussion, but is it true that HB 374 does not apply to "re-checks," after an initial building inspection?

12:37:23 From Jay Aguilar, UDOT : Thanks to Gary, Wilf, Sean and others for injecting logic and reason into the leg. process!

12:37:36 From Bill Cobabe : could a city collect the damages as prevailing party?

12:37:53 From Bill Cobabe : or is that limited to developers?

12:39:30 From Melinda Seager : There are approx. 17 century farms left in SLCo.

12:40:06 From Melinda Seager : SLCo did not have Agricultural Protected Areas available for applicants...

12:45:01 From Jay Aguilar, UDOT : Geezz who's going to pay for the potential wildland fires

12:45:04 From MEGAN RYAN : Once again here is Here is a PDF of a summary of today's bill. Cut and paste the link.https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn%3Aaaid%3Ascds%3AUS%3Aa3be2aee-a90d-4750-af99-17f500e44c50

12:46:14 From sherriel : Jay...you will...

12:54:10 From Gil Miller : Do you have any idea when these bills will show up in the State Code?

12:54:47 From sherriel : Will this be submitted for CM Credit?

12:56:49 From Victoria Ashby : Gil: It's unclear when the code will be updated by the general session bills. Leg Research usually tries to have its code database updated by end of April, mid-May but this and the other special sessions are throwing all of those timelines off.

12:57:55 From MEGAN RYAN : I will ask APA sherrie to see if they can

13:06:02 From Victoria Ashby : FYI: All bills are effective May 12 unless they have an immediate or delayed effective date.

13:08:14 From Ali Avery : Does HB359 include existing developments or only proposed developments?

13:08:34 From mhyde : HB 359 really helps in areas where septic systems are failing in the county and the owners need city sewer.

13:09:04 From BrianB : what is the download link for the power point?

13:09:38 From Tayler Jensen : https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/review/?uri=urn%3Aaaid%3Ascds%3AUS%3Aa3be2aee-a90d-4750-af99-17f500e44c50&pageNum=1

13:09:39 From MEGAN RYAN : It will be posted on APA site

13:10:56 From Bart Barker : The unincorporated area of Salt Lake County now has just over 10,000 residents, mostly in scattered islands within Sandy and other municipalities. So, as Wilf mentioned, things have substantially changed.

13:12:34 From Bart Barker : SLCo's unincorporated population estimate was 10,815 on 7/1/2019.

13:12:59 From Duncan Murray : How would HB 3004 affect an incorporation election that is already scheduled? Would it be retroactive?

13:13:41 From mhyde : 10-2-403.1. Annexation petition -- Annexation of area proposed for incorporation
32 -- Applicability of previously enacted legislation.
33 (1) A person may not file an annexation petition under Section 10-2-403 within 90

34 days before the day on which an incorporation election under Section 10-2a-210 occurs, if the

35 annexation petition proposes the annexation of an area or a portion of an area that is subject to

36 the incorporation election.

13:16:18 From Krishna Shrivastava : Megan, Will it be possible to add the chat box to the posting on the APA website. These discussions can be great teaching points and useful to jog one's memory.

13:17:18 From MEGAN RYAN : I can see if we have the technology!

13:17:29 From LaNiece Davenport : Thank you for the shoutout to WFRC's SB150 bill summary - we are happy to chat with anyone and anytime.

13:19:10 From bgehring : As for CM credits, I understood it was already approved. Just confirm that with Wilf.

13:19:58 From Victoria Ashby : I agree with Wilf: it was unclear if the transportation utility fee bill would change the litigation.

13:20:53 From Krishna Shrivastava : Thanks for the useful information. Keep elevating Utah.

13:22:57 From Beth Holbrook : Great job!

13:23:12 From Steve Mumford : Thanks for all of your work on our behalf!

13:23:19 From andreaolson : Great job everyone! Thanks for putting this together.

13:23:22 From Bill Cobabe : thank you!!!

13:23:25 From kentp : Thank You!

13:23:40 From Kippen Planning : Thank you!

13:23:41 From Shawn Guzman : Thanks everyone!!

13:23:41 From Meagan : This was great! So many attendees! Thank you!

13:23:43 From Chris Harrild : Great summaries, tracking, and info! Thank you!

13:23:44 From lmcclenning : Thanks all around. Incredibly informative.

13:23:45 From Gil Miller : Great Job AAl

13:23:46 From Jennifer Jastremsky, Draper City : thanks

13:23:51 From StephenN : thanks